U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management Carson City District Office

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Creator: Erik Pignata

Field Office: Stillwater

Lead Office: Stillwater

Case File/Project Number: NVN 090400 (supersedes NVN 012414)

Applicable Categorical Exclusion

516 DM 11.5; Appendix 4 - 151, E. Realty, #9. "Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2012-C010-0021-CX

Project Name: Mineral County Sheriff Kinkaid Renewal

Project Description:

Mineral County Sheriff's Department has applied for renewal of their existing communications facilities located at Mt. Kinkaid in Mineral County, Nevada, southeast of Hawthorne, Nevada. Their existing facilities consist of an equipment shed, access road, and underground power line.

This would be a standard FLPMA 20-year renewal. No new facilities are being authorized; it is simply a continuance of their current rights. A special stipulation is being added to the communications use lease – see below.

Under current policy, communication use leases are not "renewable." Therefore, this authorization has been reserialized under NVN 090400. However, nothing but the serial number and the special stipulation will change.

Applicant Name: Mineral County Sheriff's Department

Project Location: Mt. Kinkaid, Nevada

Exhibit map attached.

Mount Diablo Meridian

T. 8 N., R. 32 E., sec. 32, N½SE¼; sec. 33, NW¼SW¼. (within)

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 5.98 acres

Land Use Plan Conformance:

LND-7, #6: "Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

Name of Plan: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

Cultural Needs:

Under the State Protocol Agreement, finalized October 26, 2009, pg. 11, Part A. 2, states undertakings exempt from inventory and review are listed in Appendix C, Categorical Exemptions.

The action proposed in this document falls under Appendix C, pg. 38, #7 –

"Renewing existing rights-of-ways characterized by complete surface disturbance (roads, pipelines, power lines, communication sites, etc.) when no new surface disturbance is authorized."

Special Stipulations:

The following special stipulation will be added to those found in the lease agreement –

a. The holder shall contact the BLM and obtain approval from the authorized officer before beginning any activity that is a substantial deviation from this grant or that will cause new surface disturbance.

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or		al
safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs) 2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources		Ň
and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park,		UN
recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural		,
landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands		
(EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO		
13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (Archeology,		
Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or		HIZ
involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources		/m/
[NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant		Mr
environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		741
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent		les.
a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant		VIII Z
environmental effects? (PEC)		
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with		Iden
individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		JOH Z
(PEC)		
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or		
eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office?	<u>.</u>	İ
(Archeology)		1
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or		6/6
proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have		
significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (Wildlife)		
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law		140.41
or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and		new
Archeology)		1,
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect		Mica
on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		NVY Z
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian		
sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly	30	pow
adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)?		U
(Archeology) 12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued		
existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the		0.
area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the	1	3
range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)?	j	~
(Range-Jill Devaurs)		
(ixinge sin Devauls)		

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Planning Environmental Coordinator, Steve Kramer: MS 0//09/12
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: 1-9-12

Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer:

Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: \ \ -9-10
Archeology, Susan McCabe: JASON WEIGHT | -9-12

Water Quality, Gabe Venegas:

Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: 40 1-9-12

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

Field Manager

Stillwater Field Office



